Remarks:

Prior to entry of this amendment, claims 1-20 remained pending in the application. Pursuant to the September 24, 2004 Office action, claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Walker et al. (US 6,158,344). Claim 3 also stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as providing insufficient antecedent basis for the term "linefeed error." The Examiner has, however, allowed claims 10-20, and has indicated that claim 9 would be allowable if re-written in independent form. Claim 9 has been re-written in independent form.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

First considering formal matters, applicant thanks the Examiner for identifying the insufficient antecedent basis for the term "linefeed error" in claim 3. In fact, "linefeed error" should read "paper advancement error." Appropriate correction has been made. The change is believed to fully rectify the insufficient antecedent basis noted by the Examiner. Accordingly, rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 should be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

As noted above, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Walker et al. (US 6,158,344). Walker et al. discloses a method of calibrating media advancement in a printer using an optical sensor of the printer to detect marks on a calibration sheet. The marks on the calibration sheet are established: 1) "by an accurate means other than by the printer itself, such as by lithography" (column 5, lines 3-5); or 2) by printing "with longitudinally spaced nozzles or dot positions of the printhead, in a single pass or swath of the printhead,

without moving the feed roller" and using a "single nozzle or a single set of longitudinally-adjacent nozzles" (column 6, lines 18-25) (emphasis added).

As amended, claim 1 recites a linefeed calibration method for use with an inkjet printer having a printhead with a first group of nozzles and a second group of nozzles different from the first group of nozzles. The method includes: 1) "printing on media in a first sweep, a base pattern with a first group of nozzles of the printhead"; 2) "advancing the media with the media advancement mechanism"; 3) "printing on the media in a second sweep, an overlay pattern with the second group of nozzles of the printhead, the overlay pattern overlying the base pattern to form an interference pattern with a luminance representative of pattern alignment"; 4) "detecting the luminance of the interference pattern with a sensor"; and 5) "comparing the luminance of the interference pattern with a reference luminance to identify a paper advancement error."

Walker et al. does not disclose or suggest printing of an "interference pattern" as that term is used in the present application. More particularly, Walker et al. does not disclose printing of "overlying" base and overlay patterns using different groups of nozzles of a printhead, in different sweeps of the printhead. In fact, Walker specifically calls for printing each set of calibration marks "in a single pass or swath of the printhead" in order to establish known intervals between the marks (column 6, lines 18-24). Furthermore, such "intervals" are essential to Walker et al. as the intervals between adjacent calibration marks are used to determine positioning error.

Walker et al. also does not disclose or suggest detecting luminance of the interference pattern. Although the Examiner notes that Walker et al. employs an optical sensor (21), it is noted that such optical sensor is described only as being configured to "detect calibration marks." There is no indication that luminance is detected. Furthermore, the optical sensor in Walker et al. detects individual calibration marks, it does not detect the luminance of any interference pattern resulting from overlying calibration marks.

Finally, Walker et al. does not disclose or suggest comparing luminance of the interference pattern with a reference luminance to identify a paper advancement error. Although the Examiner attempts to equate an "actual value" described by Walker et al. with a reference luminance, this is not supported by Walker et al. which describes only review of intervals between calibration marks. In fact, Walker et al. does not even consider luminance (which may be affected by criteria other than spacing of marks).

For at least the foregoing reasons, the rejection of claim under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) based on Walker et al. should be withdrawn. Correspondingly, the rejection of claims 2-8 (all of which depend from claim 1) under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) based on Walker et al. also should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that this application is now in condition for allowance, in view of the above amendments and remarks. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner issue a Notice of Allowability covering the pending

claims. If the Examiner has any questions, or if a telephone interview would in any way advance prosecution of the application, please contact the undersigned attorney of record.

Respectfully submitted,

KOLISCH HARTWELL, P.C.

Walter W. Kamstein
Registration No. 35,565
Customer No. 23581
520 S.W. Yamhill Street, Suite 200
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: (503) 224-6655
Facsimile: (503) 295-6679
Attorney for Applicant

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to Examiner M. Burleson, Group Art Unit 2626, Assistant Commissioner for Patents, at facsimile number (703) 746-3006 on December 21, 2004.

Christie A Doolittle

Christie A. Doolittle